

I object to Sinclair's plans to air an anti-Kerry program without providing equivalent opportunity for effective rebuttal of the likely charges. I object in particular to their intent to label it as a news program.

Sinclair themselves foreswore politically-biased programming thinly disguised as news when they refused to broadcast ABC's listing of soldiers killed in Iraq, which they characterized as just such a program. By what criteria is this any different?

In order to ensure substantive and ultimately constructive political dialogue, and to achieve the desirable objective of an informed citizenry, those who control the medium cannot be allowed to control the message.

I believe that FCC rules are wisely constructed to ensure that those who enjoy profit from public assets must respect the public trust. If Sinclair is not restrained from blatantly partisan programming, particularly at such a critical time, then the FCC is failing in its principal duty. If not now, then when will the FCC use its power to guarantee programming in the public interest?

It is clear from the irresponsible behavior of Sinclair executives that they have forfeited a right to the public trust, and it is fervently to be hoped that their control of public airwave assets has reached its highwater mark unless they drastically and rapidly change their practices.

Taking a broader view, this situation poisonous to US democracy is a forceful argument for less not more concentration of media ownership.